



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,992	07/02/2001	Anna Belle Williams	M-9864 US	1188
33438	7590	10/05/2005		
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			EXAMINER HECK, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

hu

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,992

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Heck

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2001 and 07 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 07 September 2005 is acknowledged.

2. The following is a First Office Action in response to the application filed 02 July 2001 and the response to the restriction requirement filed 07 September 2005. Claims 1-46 are pending in the application and claims 1-16 have been examined on the merits as discussed below.

Claims 17-46 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on 07 September 2005.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 416, 1010, 1060, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1207 and 1348.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 502, 503, 504, 506, 508, 1342 and 1018.

5. Figure 8B and 8C show a pie chart with the same index, however in the specification they represent two different and distinct purposes. On page 14, lines 20-26 of the specification, Figure 8B shows where certain capacitors are used and Figure

Art Unit: 3623

8C shows the concentration of capacitors produced by certain suppliers. The Examiner requests the figures have a title on the chart to make the distinction.

6. Figures 2, 3, 8A, 11A, 11B do not have a title and Figures 2, 3 and 8A do not have y-axis titles to indicate what the unit of measure, i.e., like figures 11A and 11B.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- On page 13, lines 19-20, reference character 422 is identified as a "component type portion" and a "package type portion". Both portions are on Figure 4B and are distinct and different with only "component type portion" being associated with reference character 422.

Art Unit: 3623

- On page 19, line 8, delete "with suppliers 140", and insert -- with suppliers **160** --.
- On page 19, line 25, delete "user's web server 1018", and insert -- user's web server **1418** --. Please see drawing objection above.

The above citation is a mere guide. Applicant is requested to review the specification thoroughly to eliminate additional errors. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claims 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 8 recites determining an end-of-life date of the set of components, however the specification discloses the risk management tool includes an indicia (e.g., a date) of the projected end-of-life for components listed on the bill of materials. The claim and the specification do not disclose how an end-of-life date is determined.

Claim 9 recites identifying components at-risk from the set of components due to capital cycle risk of the set of components. The specification discloses that module 175 allows a user to determine the risk due to the capital cycle where capital cycle is determined by the predictability of demand versus supply and capital flexibility. The specification further discloses that capital cycle risk is also determined by the predictability of product demand versus supply (demand-supply predictability), where demand-supply predictability is based on the technological life cycle of the product and competition for capacity. The claim and the specification do not disclose how components at risk are identified due to capital cycle risk.

Claim 11 recites determining which components from the set of components are implicated based upon an identified geopolitical risk. The specification discloses that geopolitical risk is evaluated based on geographic concentration and the risk associated with a location. A geopolitical risk factor is used to access the risk associated with a specific component. The claim and the specification do not disclose how the components are implicated, i.e., as interpreted by the Examiner, which components are in jeopardy. That is, all components have a geopolitical risk, however it is not clear where the line is drawn to indicate which particular component is of concern, i.e., lack of supply is imminent.

Claim 12 recites determining which components from the set of components are implicated based upon an identified innovation risk. The specification discloses that innovation risk has two major drivers, which are the length of time required to transition a large percentage of the customer base to a new technology and the number of

Art Unit: 3623

product offerings containing a component subject to innovation. The claim and the specification do not disclose how the components are implicated, i.e., as interpreted by the Examiner, which components are in jeopardy, i.e., supply does not meet demand during transition.

Claim 13 recites determining which components from the set of components are implicated based upon an identified risk due to a supplier concentration. The specification discloses the concern that one supplier responsible for supplying all of a component may create risk to the continuity of supply. The claim and the specification do not disclose how the components are implicated, i.e., as interpreted by the Examiner, which components are in jeopardy, i.e., when a supplier has too much of the component business.

Claim 15 recites forecasting future requirements of a component. The specification discloses forecasting sales, which is referred to as "forecast material requirements", where, after consideration, feature 170 receives a production plan and generates a material requirement plan to support the production plan. However, the specification and claim do not disclose the process of how the future requirements are forecasted.

Claim 16 recites forecasting the future shortages of the components. The specification discloses that if materials are not available in quantities necessary to support the manufacturing plan, manufacturing schedules may be interrupted. Once a component is identified as at-risk, risk management tool 105 allows a manufacturer to determine which purchased parts are affected by at-risk components. The claim and

Art Unit: 3623

the specification do not disclose how future shortages of the components are forecasted.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. **Claims 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 provides for the use of identifying potential risk, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

12. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For the process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts. In the present case, **claim 1 and 2** only recites an abstract idea. As to **claim 1**, the recited steps of identifying a component for an assembled product, the component being purchased from a supplier, wherein identifying the component includes identifying the supplier and a manufacturer's part number of the component; and storing an identity of the component does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. The method only constitutes an idea for identifying potential risk, therefore, is deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. As to **claim 2**, the recited steps of determining a set of components for an assembled product; storing the set of components; determining a set of sub-components for the set of components; storing

Art Unit: 3623

the set of sub-components; and combining the set of components and the set of sub-components does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. The method only constitutes an idea for identifying potential risk, therefore, is deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implications of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble. In the present case, none of the recited steps are directed to anything in the technological arts as explained above. Looking at the claim as a whole, nothing in the body of the claim recites any structure or functionality to suggest that a computer performs the recited steps. Therefore, the preamble is taken to merely recite a field of use.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. In the present case, the claimed invention does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Looking at the claims as a whole, nothing in the body of the claims recite any structure or functionality to suggest that a computer performs a task. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either (a) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (b) be limited to a

Art Unit: 3623

practical application within the technological arts. Statutory requirement (a) is not satisfied since there is no physical transformation outside the computer, i.e., post-computer process activity. Therefore, statutory requirement (b) must apply, however the process merely manipulates an abstract idea or performs a purely mathematical algorithm, which is non-statutory despite the fact it may have some usefulness. Therefore, the claims as written do not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above and the process does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result the same rejection as stated above for claim 2 applies to **claims 3-16**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

14. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626). Beauchesne disclose a continuity of supply risk and cost management tool comprising:

- **[Claim 1]** identifying a component for an assembled product, the component being purchased from a supplier, wherein identifying the component includes identifying the supplier and a manufacturer's part number of the component (col. 9, lines 13-42, Beauchesne teaches the bill of material contains the name of the component, the manufacturers of the component, and the vendor designation for the component part, i.e. own part number designation); and

Art Unit: 3623

- storing an identity of the component (Figure 4, figure 5c, col. 9, lines 43-45, Beauchesne teaches the simplest form of bill of materials document contain the information stored in a table structure.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. **Claims 2, 5-7 and 15-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick et al. (Hendrick et al., Production/Operations Management, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1985, p. 226-244) in view of Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626). Hendrick et al. disclose a continuity of supply risk and cost management tool comprising:

- **[Claim 2]** determining a set of components for an assembled product (p. 231, Figure 11-3, Hendrick et al. teach bill of material.) and product structure trees;
- determining a set of sub-components for the set of components (p. 230-232, Figure 11-3, Figure 11-4, Hendrick et al. teach bill of material and product structure trees.);
- combining the set of components and the set of sub-components (p. 230-232, Figure 11-3, Figure 11-4, Hendrick et al. teach bill of material and product structure trees.).

Hendrick et al. fail to teach storing the set of components and the set of sub-components. Beauchesne teaches the simplest form of bill of materials document contain the information stored in a table structure (Figure 4, figure 5c, col. 9, lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3623

applicant's invention to modify Hendrick et al. with the ability to store component and sub-components with the teachings of Beauchesne since Beauchesne teaches the system includes a database for storing a plurality of tables containing product related information utilized in generating a bill of materials document (col. 3, lines 29-31). Database accuracy is key to efficient operations. Hendrick et al. teach batch computer system updates improves efficiency and on time orders (p. 241). Beauchesne teach eliminating duplicate information contained in a manufacturing database (col. 3, lines 17-20). Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne teach maintaining accurate database information, therefore eliminating errors that contribute to inefficiency. Both Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne teach Bill of Material, therefore there is a motivation or suggestion to combine. Both Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne teach using a computer where Beauchesne enhances how the data is to be stored for efficient utilization of computer storage space therefore there is a reasonable expectation of success. Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne combined teach all the elements of the claimed invention as indicated above.

- **[Claim 5]** storing an identity of a supplier of the set of components (Beauchesne: col. 3, lines 29-31, col. 9, lines 13-42, Beauchesne teaches the system includes a database for storing a plurality of tables containing product related information utilized in generating a bill of materials document. The bill of material contains the name of the component, the manufacturers of the component, and the vendor designation for the component part, i.e. own part number designation.).
- **[Claim 6]** storing an identity of an assembler of the set of components (Hendricks et al.: p. 230-232, Figure 11-3, Figure 11-4, Hendrick et al. teach bill of material and product structure trees. Beauchesne: col. 3, lines 29-31, col. 9, lines 13-42, Beauchesne teaches the system includes a database for storing a plurality of tables containing product related information utilized in generating a bill of materials document. The bill of material contains the

Art Unit: 3623

name of the component, the manufacturers of the component, and the vendor designation for the component part, i.e. own part number designation.).

- **[Claim 7]** determining a product assembled by a manufacturer, the product including the set of components (Hendricks et al. (Hendricks et al.: p. 230-232, Figure 11-3, Figure 11-4, Hendrick et al. teach bill of material and product structure trees, i.e. finished and packed cabinet.).
- **[Claim 15]** forecasting future requirements of a component (Hendricks et al.: p. 232, Hendrick et al. teach MRP I calculates both current and future needs for materials.).
- **[Claim 16]** forecasting future shortages of the components (Hendricks et al.: p. 242, Hendrick et al. teach MRP reports, i.e. MRP I Schedule Report, which after considering on-hand, safety stock, and open orders, planned orders are then determined. The Examiner interprets future shortages are forecasted.).

17. **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick et al. (Hendrick et al., Production/Operations Management, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1985, p. 226-244) in view of Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626) and further in view of Huang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,582). Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne disclose a continuity of supply risk and cost management tool but fail to teach storing a country of origin of the set of components. Huang et al. teach data for the supplier of components includes country (col. 114, lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Hendricks et al. and Beauchesne with the country of origin of the components since Beauchesne teach the vendor of the component. Having a vendor or vendor sources for supply of components makes it easier for purchasing to procure the components since they know whom they are dealing with. Beauchesne teach the bill of material typically has the name of the vendor or vendor sources from which the component part is purchased (col. 1, lines 24-41).

Art Unit: 3623

Huang et al. teach managing a supply chain (abstract). Therefore, having the vendor address of Huang et al. makes it easier to purchase the components.

18. **Claims 8 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick et al. (Hendrick et al., Production/Operations Management, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1985, p. 226-244) in view of Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626) and further in view of Varga et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0165805). Hendrick et al. and Beauchesne disclose a continuity of supply risk and cost management tool but fail to teach determining an end-of-life date of the set of components. Varga et al. teach a designer has the capability to view an expansive list of comparable parts provided by outside vendors along with pertinent information such as availability, end-of-life dates, and preferredness ratings (Para 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Hendricks et al. and Beauchesne with the end-of-life date of components of Varga et al. since Beauchesne the vendor of the component (Figure 4). Having accurate bill of materials improves the parts requirements process. Beauchesne teach the bill of material typically has the name of the vendor or vendor sources from which the component part is purchased (col. 1, lines 24-41). Varga et al. teach improving the parts requirement planning by providing easy visibility of part supply statuses, which enable manufacturing enterprises to improve production planning processes (Para 14). Therefore, having the vendor information ensures accurate bill of materials for improved parts requirements planning.

- **[Claim 14]** identifying components within a fixed period of an end-of-life date (Varga et al.: Para 50, Varga et al. teach a designer has the capability to view

an expansive list of comparable parts provided by outside vendors along with pertinent information such as availability, end-of-life dates, and preferredness ratings. The Examiner interpret the designer is identifying components.)

19. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick et al. (Hendrick et al., Production/Operations Management, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1985, p. 226-244) in view of Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626) and further in view of The Country Risk Service as disclosed by the applicant. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Hendricks et al. and Beauchesne with The Country Risk Service factors as disclosed by the applicant since Beauchesne teaches the system includes a database for storing a plurality of tables containing product related information utilized in generating a bill of materials document (col. 3, lines 29-31). Having a vendor or vendor sources for supply of components makes it easier for purchasing to procure the components since they know whom they are dealing with. Beauchesne teach the bill of material typically has the name of the vendor or vendor sources from which the component part is purchased (col. 1, lines 24-41).

20. **Claims 9-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrick et al. (Hendrick et al., Production/Operations Management, Richard D. Irwin, Inc. 1985, p. 226-244) in view of Beauchesne (U.S. Patent 6,128,626) as applied to claim 2. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the manufacturing and purchasing art to have a complete BOM to include material supply source, i.e. foundry, and to evaluate the risk, i.e., vendor location, how much is

Art Unit: 3623

committed to one supplier, capital investment, technology changes. As to claim 10, SC device manufacturers load their BOMs to include the foundry in which they are getting their material needed to make the chip. Having an integrated supply chain from OEM to raw material supplier is common. As to claims 9 and 11-13, Purchasing Managers will know how the company's resources are committed and know their liability, i.e. risk, if a supplier is unable to perform or if the environment changes. A Purchasing Manager for high volume production product will have either multiple sources or a back-up plan if the sole supplier is not capable of production due to any reason. Non-commodity, custom built and high dollar purchased product will be reviewed to ensure the supply of product will be minimally interrupted if a catastrophic event occurs, i.e. fire at the vendor's site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Hendricks et al. and Beauchesne to include a complete BOM and to understand sole source supplier risk since it is old and well known to use the BOM for planning procurement to include raw material and that the Purchasing Manager is held accountable and responsible for the supply of material no matter the source of supply.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

- Bott (U.S. Patent 6,856,973) discloses a method and system for assessing creditworthiness of a country.

Art Unit: 3623

- Cosset et al. (Cosset et al., The Determinants of Country Risk Ratings, Journal of International Business Studies, First Quarter 1991 [GOOGLE]) disclose country risk ratings on the basis of economic and political variables.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Michael C. Heck whose telephone number is (571) 272-6730. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday between the hours of 8:30am - 4:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 273-6729.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| (571) 273-8300 | [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled " Box AF "] |
| (571) 273-6730 | [Informal/Draft communication, labeled " PROPOSED " or " DRAFT "] |

mch
mch

29 September 2005


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600